

MED PROJECT	Methodology Checklist: Guidelines			
Guideline citation <i>(Include name of organization, title, year of publication, journal title, pages)</i>				
MED Topic:		Key Question No.(s), if applicable:		
Checklist completed by:			Date:	
SECTION 1: PRIMARY CRITERIA¹				
<i>To what extent is there</i>		<i>Assessment/Comments:</i>		
1.1	RIGOR OF DEVELOPMENT: Evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematic literature search • Study selection criteria clearly described • Quality of individual studies and overall strength of the evidence assessed • Explicit link between evidence & recommendations <i>(If any of the above are missing, rate as poor)</i>	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
1.2	RIGOR OF DEVELOPMENT: Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods for developing recommendations clearly described • Benefits/side effects/risks considered • External review 	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
1.3	EDITORIAL INDEPENDENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independence from funding source • Member conflict of interest identified 	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
<i>If any of three primary criteria are rated poor, the entire guideline should be rated poor.</i>				
SECTION 2: SECONDARY CRITERIA				
2.1	SCOPE AND PURPOSE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives described • Clinical questions described • Patients/population specified 	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
2.2	STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant professional groups represented • Patients' views and preferences sought • Target users defined • Pilot tested among target users 	GOOD	FAIR	POOR

¹ Editorial Independence is also a critical domain. However, it is often very poorly reported in guidelines. The assessor should not rate the domain, but write "unable to assess" in the comment section. If the editorial independence is rated as "poor", indicating a high likelihood of bias, the entire guideline should be assessed as poor.

SECTION 2: SECONDARY CRITERIA, Cont.				
2.3	CLARITY AND PRESENTATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations specific, unambiguous • Management options clearly presented • Key recommendations identifiable • Application tools available • Updating procedure specified 	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
2.4	APPLICABILITY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential organizational barriers discussed • Potential cost implications considered • Monitoring/audit/review criteria presented 	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
SECTION 3: OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE GUIDELINE				
3.1	How well done is this guideline?	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
3.2	Other reviewer comments:			

Description of Ratings: Methodology Checklist for Guidelines

The checklist for rating guidelines is organized to emphasize the use of evidence in developing guidelines and the philosophy that “evidence is global, guidelines are local.” This philosophy recognizes the unique situations (e.g., differences in resources, populations) that different organizations may face in developing guidelines for their constituents. The second area of emphasis is transparency. Guideline developers should be clear about how they arrived at a recommendation and to what extent there was potential for bias in their recommendations. For these reasons, rating descriptions are only provided for the primary criteria in section one. There may be variation in how individuals might apply the good, fair, and poor ratings in section two based on their needs, resources, organizations, etc.

Section 1. Primary Criteria (rigor of development and editorial independence) ratings:

Good: All items listed are present, well described, and well executed (e.g., key research references are included for each recommendation).

Fair: All items are present, but may not be well described or well executed.

Poor: One or more items are absent or are poorly conducted